arXiv:1402.2454v3 [math.AG] 10 Sep 2015

A degree bound for families of rational curves on surfaces

Niels Lubbes

September 11, 2015

Abstract

We give an upper bound for the degree of rational curves in a family that covers a given birational ruled surface in projective space. The upper bound is stated in terms of the degree, sectional genus and arithmetic genus of the surface. We introduce an algorithm for constructing examples where the upper bound is tight. As an application of our methods we improve an inequality on lattice polygons.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**
2 Intersection theory **3**
3 Adjunction **5**
4 Minimal families **9**
5 Upper bound for the level **10**
6 Algorithm for constructing examples **20**
7 Inequality for lattice polygons **26**
8 Acknowledgements **27**
Bibliography **28**

1 Introduction

A parametrization of a rational surface $\mathrm{S} \subset \mathbf{P}^n$ is a birational map

$$f : \mathbf{C}^2 \dashrightarrow \mathrm{Y} \subset \mathbf{P}^n, \quad (s,t) \mapsto (f_0(s,t) : \ldots : f_n(s,t)).$$

The *parametric degree* of S is defined as the minimum of $\max\{\deg f_i | i \in [0,n]\}$ among all birational maps f.

A bound for the parametric degree over an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0 is given in [12] in terms of the sectional genus and degree of S. In [13] bounds for the parametric degree over perfect fields are expressed in terms of the level and keel. The upper bound in [12] can be interpreted as an upper bound on the level. The analysis of [13] applied to toric surfaces led to new inequalities for invariants of lattice polygons in [5]. In subsection 2.7 of [2] it is conjectured that the inequality can be improved using the number of vertices. In [6] these inequalities for lattice polygons are translated to inequalities of rational surfaces. In the conclusion of [6] the conjecture of [2] is restated in the context of rational surfaces.

In this paper we pick up the torch and generalize the level and keel for rational surfaces in [13] to birational ruled surfaces. This generalization is also posed as an open question in [6]. Instead of the parametric degree we now consider the minimal family degree (see §4). We give an upper bound for the level of a birational ruled surface $\mathrm{S} \subset \mathbf{P}^n$ in terms of the sectional genus, degree and arithmetic genus. As a corollary we obtain an upper bound for the minimal family degree. If S is rational then our upper bound for the level coincides with the upper bound for the level in [12]. However, in order to generalize this bound we give an alternative proof. This proof enables us to make a case distinction on the invariants of S, which improves the upper bound for the level. Morever, these methods enables us to proof the correctness of an algorithm that outputs examples where our upper bound is attained. Thus we show that our upper bound for the level is tight in a combinatorial sense. This algorithm is very simple but has a non-trivial correctness proof. We use the methods of our paper to generalize the inequality in [6] to birational ruled surfaces. If we restrict our generalized inequality to toric surfaces, we obtain an improved inequality on lattice polygons as conjectured in [2]. In line of the historical context, I would like to give the torch back, wondering whether this inequality can be improved in the language of lattice geometry.

I would like to end this introduction with some additional remarks on the degree of minimal parametrizations. Let $s(f) := \max\{\deg_s f_i | i \in [0,n]\}$, $t(f) := \max\{\deg_t f_i | i \in [0,n]\}$ and we assume without loss of generality that $t(f) \geq s(f)$. The *parametric bi-degree* of S is defined as the minimum of $(s(f), t(f))$ among all birational maps f with respect to the lexicographic order on ordered pairs of integers. If $\mathrm{S} \subset \mathbf{P}^n$ attains at least 2 minimal families then from Theorem 17 in [9] it follows that the parametric bi-degree of S equals $(v(\mathrm{S}), v(\mathrm{S}))$ where $v(\mathrm{S})$ is minimal family degree. Thus in this case our upper bound for the minimal family degree translates into an upper bound of the parametric bi-degree. If S carries only one minimal family then an upper bound for the parametric bi-degree is still open. In this case we also have to incorporate the keel aside the sectional genus, degree and arithmetic genus of S.

2 Intersection theory

We recall some intersection theory and this section can be omitted by the expert. We refer to chapter 2 and 5 in [7] and chapter 1 in [11] for more details. See also [4].

The *Neron-Severi group* $N(\mathrm{X})$ of a non-singular projective surface X can be defined as the group of divisors modulo numerical equivalence. This group admits a bilinear intersection product

$$N(\mathrm{X}) \times N(\mathrm{X}) \stackrel{\cdot}{\longrightarrow} \mathbf{Z}.$$

The *Picard number* of X is defined as the rank of $N(\mathrm{X})$. The *Neron-Severi theorem* states that the Picard number is finite. For proofs in the next section we implicitly also consider $N(\mathrm{X}) \otimes \mathbf{R}$. Moreover, we switch between the linear and numerical equivalence class of a divisor where needed.

The class of an *exceptional curve* E in $N(\mathrm{X})$ is characterized by

$$E^2 = EK = -1,$$

where K is the canonical divisor class of X. *Castelnuovo's contractibility criterion* states that for all exceptional curves E there exists a contraction map

$$\mathrm{X} \stackrel{f}{\longrightarrow} \mathrm{Y},$$

such that $f(E) = p$ with p a smooth point and $(\mathrm{X} \setminus E) \longrightarrow (\mathrm{Y} \setminus p)$ is an isomorphism via f. The assignment of Neron-Severi groups is functorial such that

$$N(\mathrm{Y}) \xrightarrow{f^*} N(\mathrm{X}).$$

The groups are related by

$$N(\mathrm{X}) \cong N(\mathrm{Y}) \oplus \mathbf{Z}\langle E \rangle,$$

and thus the Picard number drops for each contracted curve. The formula for pullback of the canonical class is

$$f^*(K) = K_{\mathrm{Y}} - E.$$

Let $D \subset \mathrm{Y}$ be a divisor and let $\tilde{D}$ be the strict transform of D along f. Then

$$f^*[D] = [\tilde{D}] + mE,$$

where $[D] \in N(\mathrm{Y})$, $[\tilde{D}] \in N(\mathrm{X})$ and m is the order of D at p. For the intersection product we have the *projection formula*

$$f^*(C)A = Cf_*(A),$$

and compatibility with the pullback

$$f^*(A)f^*(B) = AB,$$

for all $A, B \in N(\mathrm{X})$ and $C \in N(\mathrm{Y})$.

The *Hodge index theorem* states that if $A^2 > 0$ and $AB = 0$ then $B^2 < 0$ or $B = 0$ for all $A, B \in N(\mathrm{X})$.

The *adjunction formula* implies that $A^2 + AK \geq -2$ for all $A \in N(\mathrm{X})$. If D is a divisor isomorphic to $\mathbf{P}^1$ then $[D]^2 + [D]K = -2$ with $[D] \in N(\mathrm{X})$.

We denote by $p_a(\mathrm{X})$ the *arithmetic genus* of X and it is a birational invariant. If X is a ruled surface then $p_a(\mathrm{X})$ equals the negative of the geometric genus of its base curve.

The *Riemann-Roch theorem* states that

$$h^0(D) - h^1(D) + h^2(D) = \frac{D(D-K)}{2} + p_a(\mathrm{X}) + 1,$$

for a divisor class D (up to linear equivalence) with associated sheaf $\mathcal{O}(D)$. Here $h^i(D)$ denotes the dimension of the i-th sheaf cohomology dim $H^i(\mathcal{O}(D))$. *Serre duality* states that $h^2(D) = h^0(K - D)$.

3 Adjunction

For standard definition such as nef and big we refer to [11]. Adjunction works over any field.

We call a divisor class D of a surface *efficient* if and only if $DE > 0$ for all exceptional curves E.

We define a *ruled pair* as a pair (X, D) where X is a non-singular birational ruled surface and D is a nef and efficient divisor class of X.

If D is effective then the *polarized model* of (X, D) is defined as $\overline{\varphi_D(\mathrm{X})} \subset \mathbf{P}^{h^0(D)-1}$ where φ_D is the map associated to the global sections $H^0(\mathcal{O}(D))$.

If (X, D) is a ruled pair then the canonical divisor class K of X is not nef. We recall that the *nef threshold* of D is defined as

$$t(D) = \sup\{q \in \mathbf{R} | D + qK \text{ is nef}\}.$$

We call a ruled pair (X, D) *non-minimal* if (D is big) and either ($t(D) = 1$ and $D \nsim -K$) or ($t(D) > 1$).

We call a ruled pair (X, D) *minimal* if either ($t(D) = 1$ and $D \sim -K$) or ($t(D) < 1$).

An *adjoint relation* is a relation

$$(\mathrm{X}, D) \xrightarrow{\mu} (\mathrm{X}', D') := (\mu(\mathrm{X}), \mu_*(D + K)),$$

where (X, D) is a non-minimal ruled pair, and $\mathrm{X} \xrightarrow{\mu} \mathrm{X}'$ is a birational morphism that contracts all exceptional curves E such that $(D + K)E = 0$.

Lemma 1. ***(adjoint relation)***

Let $(X, D) \xrightarrow{\mu} (X', D')$ be an adjoint relation.

- ***a)*** *$\mu^* D' = D + K$ and $D'^2 = (D + K)^2$.*
- ***b)*** *If $D'^2 > 0$ then $X \xrightarrow{\mu} X'$ is unique.*

Proof. Let $(E_j)_j$ be the curves that are contracted by μ.

a) See §2 for the pullback of a divisor class along a contraction map and the compatibility of pullback with the intersection product. From $(D+K)E_j = 0$ it follows that $\mu^* D' = D + K$ and thus $D'^2 = (D+K)^2$.

b) From the Hodge index theorem, $(D+K)^2 > 0$ and $(D+K)(E_1+E_2) = 0$ it follows that $(E_1+E_2)^2 < 0$ and thus $E_1 E_2 = 0$. It follows that if $D'^2 > 0$ then the contracted exceptional curves are disjoint. The contraction of an exceptional curve is an isomorphism outside this exceptional curve. Thus the order of contracting disjoint curves does not matter up to biregular isomorphism. □

Proposition 1. ***(adjoint relation)***

If $(X, D) \xrightarrow{\mu} (X', D')$ *is an adjoint relation then* (X', D') *is either a non-minimal or a minimal ruled pair.*

Proof. We use the pullback formulas for divisor classes, its compatibility with the intersection product and the projection formula as described in §2.

Suppose by contradiction that D' is not nef. It follows that there exists a curve C' such that $D'C' = \mu^* D' \mu^* C' < 0$. From $\mu^* D' \mu^* C' < 0$ and Lemma 1.a) it follows that $(D+K)C < 0$ where C is the strict transform of C'. However, the nef threshold $t(D)$ is greater or equal to one. Contradiction.

Suppose by contradiction that D' is not efficient. From Lemma 1.a) it follows that there exists exceptional curve E' such that $D'E' = \mu^* D' \mu^* E' = (D+K)E = 0$ where E is the strict transform of E'. We find that $K'\mu_* E = \mu^* K' E = -1$ and thus $KE \leq -1$. From

$$\mu^* K' \mu^* E' = \left(K - \sum_j E_j\right)\left(E + \sum_j m_j E_j\right) = KE - \sum_{a \neq b} m_a E_a E_b = -1,$$

it follows that $KE \geq -1$. From the adjunction formula and $E \cong \mathbf{P}^1$ it follows that $E^2 + EK = -2$. It follows that $E^2 = EK = -1$ and thus E is an exceptional curve not contracted by μ. Contradiction. □

We call a minimal ruled pair (X, D) a *weak Del Pezzo pair* if and only if either $D = -K$, $D = -\frac{1}{2}K$, $D = -\frac{1}{3}K$, or $D = -\frac{2}{3}K$, with K the canonical divisor class of X.

We call a minimal ruled pair (X, D) a *geometrically ruled pair* if and only if $\mathrm{X} \xrightarrow{\varphi_M} C$ is a geometrically ruled surface such that either $M = aD$, or $M = a(2D + K)$ for large enough $a \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$. Here φ_M is the map associated to the global sections $H^0(\mathcal{O}(M))$, $C = \varphi_M(\mathrm{X})$ and K is the canonical divisor class of X.

Proposition 2. ***(Neron-Severi group of minimal ruled pair)***

Let (X, D) be a minimal ruled pair, with K be the canonical divisor class of X and $N(X)$ the Neron-Severi group. Let p denote the arithmetic genus of X.

- ***a)*** *If (X, D) is a weak Del Pezzo pair with $K^2 \neq 8$ then $p = 0$, $N(X) \cong \boldsymbol{Z}\langle H, Q_1, \ldots, Q_r\rangle$ with $0 \leq r = 9 - K^2 \leq 8$ and intersection product $HQ_i = 0$, $Q_i^2 = 1$ and $Q_iQ_j = 0$ for $i \neq j$ in $[1, r]$. We have that $-K = 3H - Q_1 - \ldots - Q_r$ and either $D = -K$, $D = -\frac{1}{3}K$, or $D = -\frac{2}{3}K$.*
- ***b)*** *If (X, D) is a weak Del Pezzo pair with $K^2 = 8$ then $p = 0$, $N(X) \cong \boldsymbol{Z}\langle H, F\rangle$ with intersection product $H^2 = r$, $HF = 1$ and $F^2 = 0$ for $r \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. We have that $K = -2H + (r - 2)F$ and either $D = -K$ or $D = -\frac{1}{2}K$.*
- ***c)*** *If (X, D) is a geometrically ruled pair then $N(X) \cong \boldsymbol{Z}\langle H, F\rangle$ with intersection product $H^2 = r$, $HF = 1$ and $F^2 = 0$ for $r \in \boldsymbol{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Either $D = kF$ or $2D + K = kF$ for $k \in \boldsymbol{Z}_{>0}$ and $K = -2H + (r - 2p - 2)F$ such that $K^2 = 8(p + 1)$.*

Proof. For a) and b) see section 8.4.3 in [3]. For c) see [1], chapter 3, proposition 18, page 34. □

An *adjoint chain* of a ruled pair is defined as a chain of subsequent adjoint relations until a minimal ruled pair is obtained.

Proposition 3. ***(adjoint chain)***

The adjoint chain is finite and a minimal ruled pair at the end is either a weak Del Pezzo pair or a geometrically ruled pair.

Proof. Let (X, D) be a non-minimal ruled pair and let $t := t(D)$ be the nef threshold. From Corollary 1-2-15 in [11] it follows that $t \in \mathbf{Q}_{>0}$ with denominator bounded by 3. After a finite sequence of adjoint relations that do not contract curves we may assume that $t \leq 1$. Let K be the canonical class of X. We make a case distinction.

First suppose that $(D+tK)^2 > 0$. There exists an irreducible curve C such that $(D+tK)C = 0$, $DC > 0$ and $KC < 0$. From the Hodge index theorem and $(D+tK)^2 > 0$ it follows that $C^2 < 0$. From the adjunction formula it follows that $C^2 + KC = -2$. From Lemma 1-1-4 in [11] it follows that C is an exceptional curve. From §2 it follows that Picard number drops for each contracted exceptional curve and that this number is finite.

Next, if $(D+tK)^2 = 0$ and $D \sim -tK$ then (X, D) is a weak Del Pezzo pair.

Finally, we assume that $(D+tK)^2 = 0$ and $D \nsim -tK$. If $t = 1$ then we apply one extra adjoint relation so we may assume that $t < 1$. From Theorem 1-2-14 and Proposition 1-2-16 in [11] it follows that that the map associated to $l(D+tK)$ with large enough $l \in \mathbf{Z}_{<0}$ defines a Mori fibre space. From Theorem 1-4-4 it follows that a fibre F of this morphism is isomorphic to $\mathbf{P}^1$ with $F^2 = 0$. From the adjunction formula it follows that $FK = -2$. From $(D+tK)F = 0$ it follows that $t = \frac{DF}{2} \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{Z}_{>0}$. Thus in this case (X, D) is a geometrically ruled pair. □

Let $(\mathrm{X}_0, D_0) \xrightarrow{\mu_0} (\mathrm{X}_1, D_1) \xrightarrow{\mu_1} \ldots \xrightarrow{\mu_{l-1}} (\mathrm{X}_l, D_l)$ be an adjoint chain.

The *level* of (X_0, D_0) is defined by l.

The *keel* of (X_0, D_0) is either:

- 0 if (X_l, D_l) is a weak Del Pezzo pair, or
- k as in Proposition 2.c) if (X_l, D_l) is a geometrically ruled pair.

Proposition 4. ***(level and keel)***

The level and keel are well defined.

Proof. Let $(\mathrm{X}, D) \xrightarrow{\mu} (\mathrm{X}', D')$ be an adjoint relation.

Since $D'^2 = 0$ can only occur at the last adjoint relation in an adjoint chain it follows from Lemma 1.b) that the level is well defined.

We now show that also the keel does not depend on the last adjoint relation and thus is uniquely defined. Suppose that (X', D') is a geometrically ruled pair. From Proposition 2 and Lemma 1.a) it follows that if $D'^2 = (D+K)^2 = 0$ then $-2k = \mu^* D' \mu^* K' = (D+K)K$ defines the keel k. Similarly, if $D'^2 = (D+K)^2 > 0$ then $-2k = \mu^*(2D'+K')\mu^* K' = 2(D+K)K + K'^2$. From Proposition 2 it follows that $K'^2 = 8(p+1)$ where the arithmetic genus p is a birational invariant. It follows that our assertion holds. □

Remark 1. (level and keel)
The level and keel have been introduced in [13]. In our generalization to birational ruled surfaces we use a slightly alternative definition for the level, since it simplifies our arguments. If $D_l = -K_l$, $D_l = -\frac{1}{2}K_l$, $D_l = -\frac{1}{3}K_l$, $D_l = -\frac{2}{3}K_l$, $D_l = kF$ or $2D_l + K_l = kF$ as in Proposition 2 then we define λ as 1, $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{3}$, $\frac{2}{3}$, 0 or $\frac{1}{2}$ respectively. Now the level in [13] for rational surfaces is defined as $l + \lambda$. ◁

4 Minimal families

A *family of curves* F for ruled pair (X, D) and indexed by a smooth curve C is defined as a divisor $F \subset \mathrm{X} \times \mathrm{C}$ such that the 1st projection $F \longrightarrow \mathrm{X}$ is dominant. If the generic curve of F is rational and if DF is minimal with respect to all families of rational curves, then we call F *minimal*. The *minimal family degree* $v(\mathrm{X}, D)$ is defined as DF for a minimal family F. Note that since (X, D) is a ruled pair, there always exists a minimal family.

We recall part of Theorem 46 in [10] concerning the degree of minimal families along an adjoint relation $(\mathrm{X}, D) \xrightarrow{\mu} (\mathrm{X}', D')$. If $\mathrm{X} \cong \mathrm{X}' \cong \mathbf{P}^2$ then $v(\mathrm{X}, D) = v(\mathrm{X}', D') + 3$, else $v(\mathrm{X}, D) = v(\mathrm{X}', D') + 2$.

If (X, D) is a weak Del Pezzo pair and $\mathrm{X} \cong \mathbf{P}^2$ then $v(\mathrm{X}, D) \leq 3$. If (X, D) is a weak Del Pezzo pair and $D^2 = 8$ then $v(\mathrm{X}, D) \leq 2$ If (X, D) is a weak Del Pezzo pair and $D^2 < 8$ then $v(\mathrm{X}, D) = 2$. If (X, D) is a geometrically ruled pair then $v(\mathrm{X}, D) \leq 1$.

5 Upper bound for the level

5.1

Let $(\mathrm{X}_0, D_0) \xrightarrow{\mu_0} (\mathrm{X}_1, D_1) \xrightarrow{\mu_1} \ldots \xrightarrow{\mu_{l-1}} (\mathrm{X}_l, D_l)$ be an adjoint chain. From now on let K_i denote the canonical class of X_i. We introduce the following notation:

$$\alpha(i) = D_i^2, \quad \beta(i) = D_i K_i, \quad \gamma(i) = K_i^2, \quad h(i) = D_i^2 - D_i K_i,$$

and $n(i)$ denotes the number of curves contracted by μ_i for $i \in [0, l]$.

Lemma 2. ***(adjoint intersection products)***

If $l > 0$ then

- ***a)*** $\alpha(i+1) = \alpha(i) + 2\beta(i) + \gamma(i)$,
- ***b)*** $\beta(i+1) = \beta(i) + \gamma(i)$,
- ***c)*** $\gamma(i+1) = \gamma(i) + n(i)$,
- ***d)*** $h(i+1) = h(i) + 2\beta(i)$,

for $i \in [0, l-1]$.

Proof. We use the pullback formulas for divisor classes, its compatibility with the intersection product and the projection formula as described in §2. Now a) and b) are a straightforward consequence of Lemma 1.a). Let $(E_j)_j$ be the curves that are contracted by μ_i. For c) we compute

$$K_i^2 = (\mu_i^* K_{i+1})^2 = K_{i+1}^2 - n(i) + \sum_{j \neq k} E_j E_k,$$

and we need to show that $\sum_{j \neq k} E_j E_k = 0$. From $\mu_{i*} E_k = 0$ it follows that $K_{i+1} \mu_{i*} E_k = 0$ and thus

$$K_{i+1} \mu_{i*} E_k = \mu_i^* K_{i+1} E_k = \left(K_i - \sum_j E_j \right) E_k = -1 + 1 - \sum_{j \neq k} E_j E_k = 0.$$

This proves c). From $h(i+1) = \alpha(i+1) - \beta(i+1) = \alpha(i) + \beta(i) = h(i) + 2\beta(i)$ it follows that d) holds. □

Remark 2. (Castelnuovo)
Lemma 2.d) is essentially Lemma 7 in [12] and Josef Schicho in turn attributes this result to Castelnuovo. See remark 3 in [12]. ◁

We distinguish between the following *adjoint states*:

adjoint state	$\gamma(i)$	$\beta(i)$
$S_1(i)$	< 0	≥ 0
$S_2(i)$	< 0	< 0
$S_3(i)$	$= 0$	< 0
$S_4(i)$	> 0	< 0

for $i \in [0, l]$. The notation $S_a(i)$ for $a \in [1, 4]$ indicates that the ruled pair (X_i, D_i) has adjoint state as defined in the table above.

Lemma 3. ***(adjoint states)***

a) *The adjoint states are all possible states.*

b) *If $S_a(i)$ and $S_b(i+1)$ for $i \in [0, l-1]$ then $a \leq b$.*

Proof.
a) We assume first that $\gamma(i) = 0$. Assume by contradiction that $\beta(i) \geq 0$. From Lemma 2 it follows that $\alpha(j+1) \geq \alpha(j)$ and $\beta(j) = \beta(j+1)$ for all $j \geq i$. But then the adjoint chain is of infinite length. Contradiction.

Next we assume that $\gamma(i) > 0$. From Proposition 2 it follows that $p = \min(0, \lceil \frac{1}{8}\gamma(l) - 1 \rceil)$ and thus $p = 0$. From the Riemann Roch theorem and Serre duality it follows that $h^0(-K_i) \geq \gamma(i) + 1 > 0$. From D_i being nef it follows that $\beta(i) \leq 0$. From the Hodge index theorem it follows that $\beta(i) < 0$.

b) From Lemma 2 it follows that $\gamma(i) < \gamma(i+1)$ and if $\gamma(i) < 0$ then $\beta(i+1) < \beta(i)$. □

Lemma 4. ***(dimension)***

We have that $h(i) \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq l$.

Proof. From Lemma 2 it follows that $h(0) + h(1) = 2\alpha(0) > 0$. It follows that the induction basis $h(0) > 0$ or $h(1) > 0$ holds. By induction hypothesis $h(i) > 0$. The induction step is to show that $h(i+1) > 0$. If $\beta(i) \geq 0$ then from Lemma 2 it follows that $h(i+1) = h(i)+2\beta(i) > 0$. If $\beta(i) < 0$ then from Lemma 3 it follows that $\beta(i+1) < 0$ and thus $h(i+1) = \alpha(i+1)-\beta(i+1) > 0$. From the Riemann-Roch theorem we can conclude that $h(i)$ must be even and thus $h(i) \neq 1$. □

5.2

We will now consider the following combinatorial problem. For given

$$h(0), \beta(0), p \in \mathbb{Z},$$

find an upper bound for l such that there exists a sequence of integer 3-tuples

$$(h(i), \beta(i), \gamma(i))_{0 \leq i \leq l},$$

which adheres to the following 5 rules:

(H) $h(i+1) = h(i) + 2\beta(i)$ (Lemma 2.d)).

(B) $\beta(i+1) = \beta(i) + \gamma(i)$ (Lemma 2.b)).

(Z) $h(i) \geq 2$ for $1 \leq i \leq l$ (Lemma 4).

(S) $S_a(i)$ for $a \in [1, 4]$ and if $S_a(i)$ and $S_b(i+1)$ then $a \leq b$ (Lemma 3).

(P) $p \leq 0$. If $p = 0$ then $\gamma(l) > 0$. If $p < 0$ then $\gamma(l) = 8(p+1)$. (Proposition 2).

Using Proposition 2 it is possible to impose restrictions on $(\gamma(l), \beta(l))$ and from the Riemann-Roch theorem we can conclude that $h(i)$ must be even. However, we do not need these additional rules for a proof. For our solution of the posed problem we make a case distinction between $S_1(0)$, $S_2(0)$, $S_3(0)$ and $S_4(0)$. In the proof of Theorem 1 we will compose the upper bounds of these cases.

First we start with a technical lemma for convenience.

Lemma 5. ***(technical lemma)***

If $\gamma(0) = \ldots = \gamma(j-1)$ *for some* $1 \leq j \leq l$ *then*

$$h(j) = \gamma(0)j^2 + (2\beta(0) - \gamma(0))j + h(0).$$

Proof. With (H) we expand $h(j)$ such that

$$h(j) = h(j-1) + 2\beta(j-1) = \ldots = h(0) + 2\sum_{n=0}^{j-1}\beta(n).$$

With (B) we expand the $\beta(i)$ terms such that

$$h(j) = h(0) + 2\sum_{n=0}^{j-1}(\beta(0) + n\gamma(0)) = h(0) + 2j\beta(0) + j(j-1)\gamma(0).$$

We conclude this proof by re-arranging terms. □

Lemma 6. ***(case*** $S_4(0)$***)***

If $S_4(0)$ *then*

$$l \leq -\beta(0) - 1 < \frac{h(0) - 2}{2}.$$

Proof. From (S) and (B) it follows that $\beta(0) < \ldots < \beta(l) < 0$ and thus we conclude the first inequality. The second inequality follows from $h(0) + 2\beta(0) \geq 2$. □

Lemma 7. ***(case*** $S_3(0)$***)***

If $S_3(0)$ *then*

$$l \leq \frac{h(0) - 2}{2}.$$

Moreover, if l *is equal to this upper bound then* $S_3(l-1)$.

Proof. It follows from (H) and (S) that $h(i+1) - h(i) = 2\beta(i) \leq -2$ if $S_3(i)$ or $S_4(i)$ for all $0 \leq i \leq l$. The upper bound asserted in the lemma now follows from (Z). This upper bound is attained if $\beta(i) = -1$ for $0 \leq i \leq l$. It follows that $S_4(i)$ if and only if $i = l$ and $p = 0$. Thus we can conclude from (S) that $S_3(l-1)$ in case of equality. □

For an example where the upper bound of Lemma 7 is attained, see $3 \leq i \leq 7$ in Table 1 of Example 1.

Lemma 8. ***(case*** $S_2(0)$ ***with*** $p \geq -1$***)***

If $S_2(0)$ *and* $p \geq -1$ *then*

$$l < \frac{h(0)-2}{2}.$$

If $\beta(0) - \beta(l) > 0$ *then*

$$l \leq s + \left\lfloor \frac{-s^2 + (2\beta(0)+1)s + h(0) - 2}{-2\beta(l)} \right\rfloor,$$

where $s := \beta(0) - \beta(l)$.

Proof. Suppose that $s > 0$. It follows from (S) and (B) that if $S_3(k)$ or $S_4(k)$ then $\beta(k) \leq \beta(l)$ for $0 \leq k \leq l$. From (B) it follows that $k \geq s$ where we have equality if $\gamma(0) = \ldots = \gamma(k-1) = -1$. It now follows from Lemma 5 that

$$h(k) \leq h(s) = -s^2 + (2\beta(0)+1)s + h(0).$$

It follows from (S) that $\beta(i) < 0$ for $k \leq i \leq l$. From (Z) and thus the same argument in Lemma 7 it follows that

$$l \leq s + \frac{h(s)-2}{-2\beta(l)}.$$

The first inequality follows if $\beta(0) = \beta(l) = -1$ such that $s = 0$. □

For an example where the second upper bound of Lemma 8 is attained, see $6 \leq i \leq 12$ in Table 2 of Example 1.

Lemma 9. ***(case*** $S_2(0)$ ***with*** $p \leq -2$***)***

If $S_2(0)$ *with* $p \leq -2$ *then*

$$l \leq \left\lfloor \frac{-(2\beta(0)-t) - \sqrt{\Delta}}{2t} \right\rfloor,$$

where $\Delta = (2\beta(0)-t)^2 - 4t(h(0)-2)$ *and* $t := 8(p+1)$.

Proof. From (P) and (S) it follows that $\gamma(l) = 8(p+1)$ and $S_2(l)$. From (Z) and (H) it follows that $h(l) + 2\beta(l) \leq 0$. It follows from (H) that $h(i)$ decreases as slow as possible if $\gamma(0) = \ldots = \gamma(l)$. It follows from (Z) that $h(l) \geq 2$ so that we can equate the formula of Lemma 5 to 2. The upper bound for l now follows from the quadratic formula. □

For an example where the upper bound of Lemma 9 is attained, see $5 \leq i \leq 9$ in Table 4 of Example 1.

Lemma 10. ***(case*** $S_1(0)$***)***

If $S_1(0)$ *and* j *is the largest index such that* $S_1(j-1)$ *then*

$$j \leq \left\lfloor \frac{\beta(0)}{-t} \right\rfloor + 1,$$

and

$$h(j) \leq t\left(\left\lfloor \frac{\beta(0)}{-t} \right\rfloor + 1\right)^2 + (2\beta(0) - t)\left(\left\lfloor \frac{\beta(0)}{-t} \right\rfloor + 1\right) + h(0),$$

where

$$t := \min(8(p+1), -1).$$

Moreover, if the upper bound for j *and* $h(j)$ *is reached then* $\beta(j) = t$.

In case $p \geq -1$ *then the upper bound for* $h(j)$ *simplifies to*

$$h(j) \leq \beta(0)^2 + \alpha(0).$$

Proof. From (S) and (P) we find that $\gamma(i) \leq t$ for $i < j$. It follows from (S) and (B) that in order to find an upper bound for j we need to assume that $\gamma(0) = \ldots = \gamma(j-1) = t$ such that

$$\beta(j-1) = \beta(j-2) - \gamma(0) = \ldots = \beta(0) - (j-1)\gamma(0) = 0.$$

From this we conclude the upper bound for j. The upper bound for $h(j)$ is reached if we substitute the upper bound for j in the formula of Lemma 5. From (B) it follows that $\beta(j) = t$ if the upper bounds for j and $h(j)$ are reached. If $p \geq -1$ then t divides $\beta(0)$ so that this formula simplifies. □

For an example where upper bound of Lemma 10 is attained, see $0 \leq i \leq 2$ in Table 1 of Example 1.

Theorem 1. ***(upper bound level)***

We state upper bounds for the level in terms of $\alpha(0)$, $\beta(0)$ *and* p, *where* p *is the arithmetic genus of* X_0.

If $p = 0$ *or* $p = -1$ *then*

$$l \leq \frac{\beta(0)^2 + \alpha(0)}{2} + \beta(0),$$

and if moreover $\beta(0) < 0$ *then*

$$l \leq \frac{\alpha(0) - \beta(0) - 2}{2}.$$

If $p \leq -2$ *then*

$$l \leq \left\lfloor \frac{\beta(0)}{-t} \right\rfloor + 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{-t - \sqrt{t^2 - 4t(\Upsilon - 2)}}{2t} \right\rfloor,$$

and if moreover $\beta(0) < 0$ *then*

$$l \leq \left\lfloor \frac{-(2\beta(0) - t) - \sqrt{\Delta}}{2t} \right\rfloor,$$

where

$$t := 8(p+1) \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta := (2\beta(0) - t)^2 - 4t(\alpha(0) - \beta(0) - 2),$$

and

$$\Upsilon := t\left(\left\lfloor \frac{\beta(0)}{-t} \right\rfloor + 1\right)^2 + (2\beta(0) - t)\left(\left\lfloor \frac{\beta(0)}{-t} \right\rfloor + 1\right) + \alpha(0) - \beta(0).$$

Proof. Recall that by definition $h(0) = \alpha(0) - \beta(0)$. Thus in order to proof this theorem we need to solve the problem as posed at the beginning of §5.2.

First we assume that $-1 \leq p \leq 0$. It follows from (S) that an upper bound of l is obtained as the composition of the upper bound of Lemma 10 with the upper bound of either Lemma 8, Lemma 7 or Lemma 6. It follows that the upper bound of Lemma 7 is the choice which acquires the highest upper bound. If $\beta(0) < 0$ then we can apply the upper bound of Lemma 7 directly.

If $p \leq -2$ then it follows from (S) and (P) that the upper bound as asserted in this theorem can be obtained by composing the upper bound of Lemma 10 with the upper bound in Lemma 9. If $\beta(0) < 0$ then we can apply the upper bound of Lemma 9 directly. □

Corollary 1. ***(upper bound minimal family degree)***

Let $v = v(X_0, D_0)$ be the minimal family degree. Let $\tilde{l}$ be the upper bound for the level from Theorem 1.

If $p = 0$ then $v \leq 2\tilde{l} + 2$.

If $p \leq -1$ then $v \leq 2\tilde{l} + 1$.

Proof. We recall from §4 that if $\mathrm{X}_i \cong \mathrm{X}_{i+1} \cong \mathbf{P}^2$ then $p = 0$ and

$$v(i+1) = v(i) + 3,$$

where $v(i) := v(\mathrm{X}_i, D_i)$. Otherwise $v(i+1) = v(i) + 2$. We want to show that $3l + 3 < 2\tilde{l} + 2$ and thus we may assume that the minimal family degree is increased by 2 at each step.

First we observe that if $X_i \cong \mathbf{P}^2$ then $\gamma(i) = 9$ and thus $S_4(i)$ for all $0 \leq i \leq l$. So we may assume without loss of generality that $S_4(0)$. Suppose that $X_i \cong \mathbf{P}^2$ for $0 \leq i \leq l$ such that $v(i+1) = v(i) + 3$ at each step. In this case it follows from Proposition 2 that $v(l) \leq 3$ and $\beta(l) \leq -3$. It follows from (H) and (Z) that

$$l \leq \frac{h(0) - 2}{6} \quad \text{and thus} \quad v \leq 3\left(\frac{h(0) - 2}{6}\right) + 3.$$

For the upper bound $\tilde{l}$ we may assume without loss of generality that $\beta(0) < 0$ since if $S_1(i)$ then $X_i \ncong \mathbb{P}^2$ for all $0 \leq i \leq l$. From Theorem 1 we used Lemma 7 and thus assumed $S_3(i)$ with $\beta(i) = \beta(l) = -1$ for $0 \leq i \leq l - 1$. In this case it follows from Proposition 2 that $v(l) \leq 2$. It follows that

$$l \leq \tilde{l} = \frac{h(0) - 2}{2} \quad \text{and thus} \quad v \leq 2\left(\frac{h(0) - 2}{2}\right) + 2.$$

Thus indeed we established that $3l + 3 < 2\tilde{l} + 2$. We conclude this proof by recalling from §4 that if $p \leq -1$ then $v(l) \leq 1$. □

Remark 3. (computing invariants)
Note that $\alpha(0)$ is the degree of the (projection of the) polarized model of (X_0, D_0). From the adjunction formula it follows that the geometric genus of a generic hyperplane section of (X_0, D_0) is equal to the arithmetic genus

$$p_a(D_0) = \frac{\alpha(0) + \beta(0)}{2} + 1.$$

It follows that $\alpha(0)$ and $\beta(0)$ can be computed from the degree and geometric genus of a generic hyperplane section.

If the coordinate ring of the initial surface represented by (X_0, D_0) is integrally closed then it is not a projection of the polarized model $\mathrm{Y} \subset \mathbf{P}^n$. Thus the initial surface represented by (X_0, D_0) is normal. From Proposition 3 it follows that

$$n + 1 = h^0(D_0) = \frac{\alpha(0) - \beta(0)}{2} + p + 1$$

and thus we can compute the arithmetic genus p of X_0. $\lhd$

Example 1. (adjoint chains)
In the following 4 tables we represent the invariants that follow the combinatorics of adjoint chains. We denote the upper bound of Theorem 1 by $\tilde{l}(i)$. See the beginning of §5.1 for the remaining notation. The heading of each table denotes the arithmetic genus of X_0 and the number of different adjoint states that are reached. The transition between adjoint states is indicated by a vertical double line. These examples confirm that the upper bounds in Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 are tight with respect to the combinatorics. The tables were constructed using Algorithm 1 (see forward).

In Table 1 the minimal pair is a weak Del Pezzo pair of degree 1. The upper bound for the level is tight for this example and it follows the analysis of the proof of Theorem 1. The polarized model of this surface is of degree 8. From §4 it follows that $v(\mathrm{X}_0) = 18$.

In Table 2 the minimal pair is a weak Del Pezzo pair of degree 3. We see that the upper bound for the level is not tight in this example. All the adjoint states are reached in this example. If the arithmetic genus is zero then the upper bound is tight if adjoint state S_2 is not reached, as was the case in Table 1.

In Table 3 the minimal pair is a geometrically ruled surface such that $p = -1$ and $2D + K = kF$ as in Proposition 2. We find that the upper bound for the

level in Theorem 1 is tight. The upper bound for the minimal family degree in Corollary 1 is also tight: $v(\mathrm{X}_0) = 17$.

In Table 4 the minimal pair is a geometrically ruled surface such that $p = -2$ and $D = kF$ as in Proposition 2. We find that the upper bound for the level is tight. From Corollary 1 it follows that $v(\mathrm{X}_0) \leq 19$. From §4 and $\alpha(l) = 0$ it follows that $v(\mathrm{X}_0) = 18$.

Table 1 (arithmetic genus 0 and 3 adjoint states)

i	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
$n(i)$	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
$\gamma(i)$	-1	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	1
$\beta(i)$	2	1	0	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
$h(i)$	6	10	12	12	10	8	6	4	2
$\alpha(i)$	8	11	12	11	9	7	5	3	1
$\tilde{l}(i)$	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

Table 2 (arithmetic genus 0 and 4 adjoint states)

i	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
$n(i)$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	
$\gamma(i)$	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	3
$\beta(i)$	5	4	3	2	1	0	-1	-2	-3	-3	-3	-3	-3
$h(i)$	6	16	24	30	34	36	36	34	30	24	18	12	6
$\alpha(i)$	11	20	27	32	35	36	35	32	27	21	15	9	3
$\tilde{l}(i)$	23	22	21	20	19	18	17	8	4	3	2	1	0

Table 3 (arithmetic genus -1 and 2 adjoint states)

i	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
$n(i)$	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
$\gamma(i)$	-1	-1	-1	0	0	0	0	0	0
$\beta(i)$	2	1	0	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1
$h(i)$	6	10	12	12	10	8	6	4	2
$\alpha(i)$	8	11	12	11	9	7	5	3	1
$\tilde{l}(i)$	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

Table 4 (arithmetic genus -2 and 2 adjoint states)

i	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
$n(i)$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
$\gamma(i)$	-8	-8	-8	-8	-8	-8	-8	-8	-8	-8
$\beta(i)$	32	24	16	8	0	-8	-16	-24	-32	-40
$h(i)$	40	104	152	184	200	200	184	152	104	40
$\alpha(i)$	72	128	168	192	200	192	168	128	72	0
$\tilde{l}(i)$	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0

. $\triangleleft$

6 Algorithm for constructing examples

6.1

We use the same notation as in the previous section. The following lemma expresses the invariants of the first ruled pair in an adjoint chain in terms of $n(i)$ and the invariants of the minimal pair.

Lemma 11. ***(formulas for intersection products)***

a) $\alpha(0) = \gamma(l)l^2 - 2\beta(l)l + \alpha(l) - \sum_{i=0}^{l-1}(i+1)^2 n(i).$

b) $\beta(0) = -\gamma(l)l + \beta(l) + \sum_{i=0}^{l-1}(i+1)n(i).$

c) $\gamma(0) = \gamma(l) - \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} n(i).$

Proof. Let R_i be sum of exceptional curves that are contracted by μ_i for $0 \leq i < l$. From the pullback formula for the canonical class in §2 and from Lemma 1.a) it follows that $K_{i-1} = \mu_{i-1}^* K_i + R_{i-1}$ and $D_{i-1} = \mu_{i-1}^* D_i - K_{i-1}$. By abuse of notation we will denote $\mu_{i-1}^* D_i$ as D_i and $\mu_{i-1}^* K_i$ as K_i.

It follows that $D_{l-1} = D_l - K_l - R_{l-1}$. In the next iteration we obtain $D_{l-2} = D_{l-1} - K_{l-1} - R_{l-2} = (D_l - K_l - R_{l-1}) - (K_l + R_{l-1}) - (R_{l-2}) = D_l - 2K_l - 2R_{l-1} - R_{l-1}$. Repeating this we obtain

$$D_0 = D_l - lK_l - \sum_{i=0}^{l-1}(i+1)R_i.$$

Similary we find

$$K_0 = K_l + \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} R_i.$$

From Lemma 2.c), it follows that $R_i^2 = -n(i)$. From the projection formula in §2 it follows that $R_i R_j = D_l R_i = K_l R_i = 0$ for $i, j \in [0, l]$. □

The following algorithm outputs—for a given level, invariants of minimal ruled pair and the degree of the first ruled pair—invariants that follow the combinatorics of an adjoint chain. Moreover, the upper bound of Theorem 1 approximates the input level as close as possible. The adjoint chain invariants in Example 1 were constructed with this algorithm and proof that the upper bounds of Theorem 1 are tight in a combinatorial sense.

Algorithm 1. ***(construct adjoint chain)***

input: *Level l, $\alpha(l)$, $\beta(l)$, $\gamma(l)$ and $c \in \boldsymbol{Z}_{\geq 1}$.*

output: *The number of contracted curves $n(i)$ for $i \in [0, l-1]$ such that the difference between l and the upper bound in Theorem 1 is minimal, under the condition that $\alpha(0) = c$. If the output is $\emptyset$ then no such valid adjoint chain exists for given input.*

method: *Below is the description of the algorithm in pseudo code using python syntax (`#` is for commenting). The values* `l,al,bl,gl,c,None` *denote $l, \alpha(l)$, $\beta(l)$, $\gamma(l)$, c, $\emptyset$ respectively. The function* `a0(l, al, bl, gl, n)` *computes $\alpha(0)$ with the formula of Lemma 11.a).*

```
def construct_adjoint_chain( l, al, bl, gl, c ):

    n = l * [0]  # n is a list of l zeros [0,...,0]
    while True:

        # compute the maximal index j<=l-1 such that
        # a0(m)>=c where m equals n with j-th index
        # increased by one.
        j = -1
        m = copy( n )  # m is set equal to list n
        while a0( l, al, bl, gl, m ) >= c and j <= l - 2:
            j = j + 1
            m = copy( n )
            m[j] = m[j] + 1

        if a0( l, al, bl, gl, m ) < c:
            j = j - 1

        if j >= 0:
            n[j] = n[j] + 1
        elif a0( l, al, bl, gl, n ) >= c:
            return n
        else:
            return None
```

◁

Proposition 5. ***(algorithm)***

Algorithm 1 is correct.

Proof. Note that the output and input of Algorithm 1 uniquely defines a sequence of invariants conform the rules of Lemma 2, Lemma 3 and Lemma 4:

$$(n(i), \gamma(i), \beta(i), h(i), \alpha(i))_{0 \leq i \leq l-1}.$$

In particular all the tables of Example 1 are constructed with Algorithm 1. We denote by $\tilde{l}$ the upper bound of Theorem 1 which depends on $\alpha(0)$, $\beta(0)$ and p. From Proposition 2 we see that if $\gamma(l) > 0$ then $p = 0$ and otherwise $\gamma(l) = 8(p+1)$.

From Lemma 11.a) it is immediate that the algorithm terminates. We prove that the algorithm outputs $n = (n(i))_i$, such that $\tilde{l} - l$ is minimal under the condition that $\alpha(0) = c$.

Claim 1: In order to minimize $\tilde{l} - l$ we need to minimize $\gamma(l) - \gamma(0)$ and maximize $\beta(0)$.

For the upper bound for l as asserted in Lemma 6 ($S_4(0)$) we assumed that $\gamma(0) = \ldots = \gamma(l) = 1$ and $\beta(0) > 0$. For the upper bound for l as asserted in Lemma 7 ($S_3(0)$) we assumed that $\gamma(0) = \ldots = \gamma(l-1) = 0$ and $\beta(0) = \ldots = \beta(l) = -1$. For the upper bound for l as asserted in Lemma 8 ($S_2(0)$ and $p \geq -1$) we assumed that $\gamma(0) = \ldots = \gamma(s-1) = -1$, $\gamma(s) = \ldots = \gamma(l-1) = 0$ and $\beta(s) = \ldots = \beta(l) = -1$ such that $S_2(s-1)$ and $S_3(s)$. For the upper bound for l as asserted in Lemma 9 ($S_2(0)$ and $p \leq -2$) we assumed that $\gamma(0) = \ldots = \gamma(l)$. It follows—under the constraints of Lemma 3—that in order to minimize $\tilde{l} - l$ we want to minimize $\gamma(l) - \gamma(0)$ and maximize $\beta(0)$. This completes the proof of claim 1.

From Lemma 11.c) we find that we minimize $\gamma(l) - \gamma(0)$ if we minimize:

$$\Gamma := \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} n(i).$$

From Lemma 11.b) we find that we maximize $\beta(0)$ if we maximize:

$$\Theta := \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} (i+1) n(i).$$

From Lemma 11.a) we find that $\alpha(0) = C - \Lambda$ where

$$\Lambda := \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} (i+1)^2 n(i),$$

and C is a constant which depends on the input. If $C < c$ then the algorithm returns $\emptyset$. Otherwise, we ensure that $\alpha(0) = c$ with the $n(0)$ term in Λ.

At each step of the while-loop the algorithm increases $n(i)$ with one, for as large possible i, under the constraint that $\alpha(0) \geq c$. This way Θ is maximized since the coefficient of $n(i)$ is $i+1$. The term Λ is maximized even more since the coefficient of $n(i)$ equals $(i+1)^2$. Therefore the condition $\alpha(0) = c$ is met in a minimal number of steps. Thus Γ is minimized under the constraint that $\alpha(0) \geq c$. Now it follows from claim 1 that the output of the algorithm is conform its specification. □

6.2 Geometric meaning of the constant c

Suppose that the adjoint chain of (X_0, D_0) has invariants conform input and output of Algorithm 1. From Proposition 2 it follows that the arithmetic genus of X_0 equals $p = \min(0, \lceil \frac{1}{8}\gamma(l) - 1 \rceil)$.

The input constant c equals the degree of the polarized model of (X_0, D_0).

We will now argue that the constant c also measures the embedding dimension of the polarized model of (X_0, D_0). Recall that the embedding dimension of the polarized model of (X_0, D_0) equals $h^0(D_0) - 1$. If D_0 is ample then it follows from Kodaira vanishing and Riemann-Roch that

$$h^0(D_0) = \frac{h(0)}{2} + p + 1.$$

By increasing the input constant c we increase $h(0)$ and consequently $h^0(D_0)$. If $D_0 - K_0$ is only nef and big then alternatively we can use the Kawamata-Viehweg vanishing theorem. See chapter 4 in [8] for vanishing theorems.

Recall that by definition of nef and big only a high enough multiple of D_0 defines a birational morphism. Reiders theorem says that if $c = D_0^2 \geq 10$ and there exists no curve C such that ($D_0 C = 0$ and $C^2 = -1$) or ($D_0 C = 1$ and $C^2 = 0$) or ($D_0 C = 2$ and $C^2 = 0$) then $D_0 + K_0$ defines a birational morphism. This can be used to ensure that the polarized model of (X_1, D_1) is a surface.

6.3 Computing examples from output of algorithm

Let input l, $\alpha(l)$, $\beta(l)$, $\gamma(l)$, c and output $(n(i))_{0\leq i\leq l-1}$ of Algorithm 1 be given. The output of Algorithm 1 is not necessarily *geometric* in the sense that (X_0, D_0) exists such that the polarized model of (X_0, D_0) is a surface. In particular, $\alpha(l)$, $\beta(l)$, $\gamma(l)$ has to be conform Proposition 2. However, if the output is geometric then we can compute—at least in theory—equations for a polarized model of (X_0, D_0) such that its adjoint chain has the corresponding invariants.

For the sake of simplicity we assume that X_l is the blowup of the projective plane with $D_l = -K_l$ as in Proposition 2. We blow up X_l in $n(l-1)$ generic points. It follows from Lemma 1.a) and the pullback formula for the canonical class in §2 that

$$D_{l-1} = \mu^* D_l - \mu^* K_l + \sum_{i=1}^{n(l-1)} E_i',$$

where E_i' are disjoint exceptional curves. Similar as in the proof of Lemma 11, we find after sequentially taking the pullback as above that

$$D_0 = dH - \sum_j m_j E_j,$$

where H is the pullback of lines in the projective plane, $m_j > 0$ and the E_j are the pullback of exceptional curves. Note that $D_0^2 = c$ by assumption.

We construct a linear series $|D_0|$ in the plane with polynomials of degree d and generic base points with multiplicities $(m_i)_i$. We check whether the map associated to the linear series parametrizes a surface, otherwise we have to consider a multiple of D_0 (see §6.2). After a generic projection we may assume that we have a parametrization of a hypersurface in 3-space. We consider an implicit equation of degree $\alpha(0)$ with undetermined coefficients and substitute the parametrization. We obtain an implicit equation by solving the linear system of equations in the undetermined coefficients.

See Example 52 in [10] for worked out equations for a surface of degree 8 with a minimal family of degree 8. As illustrated in Table 1 of Example 1, a surface of degree 8 has minimal family degree of at most 18.

7 Inequality for lattice polygons

Let (X_0, D_0) be a toric surface with polarized model $\mathrm{Y}_0 \subset \mathbf{P}^n$. We define the lattice polygon P_0 by taking the convex hull of the lattice points in the lattice $\mathbf{Z}^2 \subset \mathbf{R}^2$ with coordinates defined by the exponents of a monomial parametrization $(\mathbf{C}^*)^2 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Y}_0$.

We denote $\rho(0)$ for the Picard number of X_0. We define $S(0)$ to be the number of exceptional divisors in the minimal resolution of the isolated singularities of Y_0. We introduce the following notation:

$$v(0) := \rho(0) + 2 - S(0).$$

The *adjoint* of a lattice polygon is defined as the convex hull of its interior lattice points. We call a lattice polygon *minimal* if its adjoint is either the empty set, a point or a line segment. The *level* $l(P_0)$ of a lattice polygon is defined as the number of subsequent adjoint lattice polygons $P_0 \longrightarrow \ldots \longrightarrow P_{l(P_0)}$ until a minimal lattice polygon $P_{l(P_0)}$ is obtained. See Remark 1 concerning the alternative definition for level as in [5].

We recall part of the dictionary in [6] using the notation at the beginning of §5.1:

- $\frac{\alpha(0)}{2} = a(P_0)$ (area),
- $-\beta(0) = b(P_0)$ (number of boundary lattice points),
- $v(0) = v(P_0)$ (number of vertices), and
- $l = l(P_0)$ (level).

From Lemma 11 it follows that

$$\alpha(0) + 2l\beta(0) = -\gamma(l)l^2 + \alpha(l) + \Phi, \tag{1}$$

where

$$\Phi := \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} (2l - i - 1)(i + 1)n(i).$$

As an immediate consequence we obtain the following inequality

$$\alpha(0) + 2l\beta(0) + \gamma(l)l^2 \geq 0. \tag{2}$$

From Proposition 2 it follows that $\gamma(l) \leq 9$ and by substituting 9 for $\gamma(l)$ in (2) we recover the inequality of Theorem 5 in [6]. Moreover, we see that the inequality holds more generally for birationally ruled surfaces. Note that for irrational birationally ruled surfaces we have that $\gamma(l) \leq 0$.

We want improve (2) by bounding Φ in terms of $v(0)$. From Proposition 2 it follows that $\rho(l) \leq 9$. We recall from §2 that the Picard number decreases by 1 for each contracted exceptional curve, and thus

$$\sum_{i=0}^{l-1} n(i) \geq \rho(0) - 9 \geq v(0) - 11.$$

From $(2l - i - 1)(i + 1) \geq 2l - 1$ for all $i \in [0, l - 1]$ it follows that

$$\Phi \geq (2l - 1) \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} n(i) \geq (2l - 1)(v(0) - 11). \tag{3}$$

Now from (1), (3) and $\alpha(l) \geq 0$ we obtain the following inequality on invariants of birationally ruled surfaces:

Theorem 2.

$$\alpha(0) + 2l\beta(0) + 9l^2 \geq (2l - 1)(v(0) - 11).$$

Restricting to toric surfaces and applying the dictionary we obtain an improved inequality for lattice polygons, as was predicted in [2]:

Corollary 2.

$$2a(P_0) - 2l(P_0)b(P_0) + 9l(P_0)^2 \geq (2l(P_0) - 1)(v(P_0) - 11).$$

8 Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Josef Schicho and RISC/RICAM in Linz, Austria, for their warm hospitality and interesting discussions.

Bibliography

[1] A. Beauville. *Complex algebraic surfaces*, volume 68 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1983. ISBN 0-521-28815-0. Translated from the French by R. Barlow, N. I. Shepherd-Barron and M. Reid.

[2] W. Castryck. Moving out the edges of a lattice polygon. *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, 47(3):496–518, 2012.

[3] I. V. Dolgachev. *Classical algebraic geometry: A modern view*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012. http://www.math.lsa.umich.edu/~idolga/CAG.pdf.

[4] P. Griffiths and J. Harris. *Principles of algebraic geometry*. Wiley-Interscience [John Wiley & Sons], New York, 1978. ISBN 0-471-32792-1. Pure and Applied Mathematics.

[5] C. Haase and J. Schicho. Lattice polygons and the number $2i+7$. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 116(2):151–165, 2009.

[6] C. Haase and J. Schicho. An inequality for adjoint rational surfaces. *arXiv:1306.3389*, 2013.

[7] R. Hartshorne. *Algebraic geometry*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1977. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 52.

[8] R. Lazarsfeld. *Positivity in algebraic geometry. I*, volume 48. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004. Classical setting: line bundles and linear series.

[9] N. Lubbes. Minimal families of curves on surfaces. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 2013. Accepted, arXiv:1302.6687.

[10] N. Lubbes and J. Schicho. Lattice polygons and families of curves on rational surfaces. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, pages 1–24, 2010.

[11] K. Matsuki. *Introduction to the Mori program*. Universitext. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.

[12] J. Schicho. A degree bound for the parameterization of a rational surface. *J. Pure Appl. Alg.*, 145:91–105, 2000.

[13] J. Schicho. The parametric degree of a rational surface. *Math. Z.*, 254: 185–198, 2006.

address of author: KAUST (King Abdullah University of Science and Technology), Thuwal, Saudi Arabia
email: niels.lubbes@gmail.com